REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following discussion:

REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION:

The Examiner has required that applicants submit all prior versions of the SafeTrace Tx Table Administration Manual, User's Guide and Reference Manual version 1.2.0.0. The only prior version was 1.1.1.0 listed below and dated October 1999 and, each version is basically the same as version 1.2.0.0. The following is a detailed comparison taken from the respective versions of each:

TABLE ADMINISTRATION MANUAL:

SafeTrace Tx v.1.1.1.0 SafeTrace Tx v1.2.0.0
Flyleaf: October, 1999 Flyleaf: November, 1999
The index has the same headings for the subject matter in both volumes and the same number of pages.

USER'S GUIDE:

SafeTrace Tx v.1.1.1.0 SafeTrace Tx v1.2.0.0
Flyleaf: October, 1999 Flyleaf: November, 1999
The index has the same headings for the subject matter in both volumes and the page numbers differ. V.1.1.1.0 goes to page 194 and v.1.2.0.0 goes to page 198.

REFERENCE MANUAL:

SafeTrace Tx v.1.1.1.0 SafeTrace Tx v1.2.0.0
Flyleaf: October, 1999 Flyleaf: November, 1999
The index has the same headings for the subject matter in both volumes and the same number of pages.

There are no other versions of the Manuals or User Guide referred to in the application. Copies of the index for each is

attached but in the interest of not burdening the Patent Office with unnecessary copies will not forward the first version unless the Examiner still wants to see it.

Furthermore, applicants are not aware of any similar products or services that would constitute prior art and that was used in the development of this invention and did not rely on any other publication in the development of the disclosed subject matter. In this regard, the inventors stand on the statements made in the Declaration submitted at the time of filing this application.

Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 10-12 and all claims dependent therefrom as being confusing; and, for example, refers to the three steps recited in claim 1 of determining the antigens and antibodies present, remote serological cross-matching, and determining the capability of said segment and patient specimen selected.

In response, there are three separate steps as defined above and is fully supported by the Specification. The Examiner acknowledges that the step of "determining the antigens and antibodies present or absent" is a separate and distinct step from the compatibility determination in the subsequent steps but that the "determination of compatibility" steps fail to distinguish from one another and appear to be redundant.

The second step, namely, "remote serological cross-matching each said patient specimen and said specimen of said blood product at said central blood testing facility to determine their compatibility with one another" is described, for example, at page 13, lines 2 to 12 which makes clear that the segment is tested with the patient specimen to determine compatibility as a part of the completion of the cross-matching step. The results are then entered into the computer program database.

With respect to the third step, namely, "determine the compatibility of said segment and patient specimen selected by comparing the antigens and antibodies to determine whether each is present in said segment and said patient specimen tested" is described, for example, at page 14, line 25 to page 15, line 30 and is carried out after the results have been entered in the database. This step has been amended to recite "verifying . . . from the results entered in said database by comparing the antigens and antibodies . . . ." and is believed to avoid any redundancy in language and as emphasized is a separate step conducted from the first and second steps recited. For example, as described with respect to the preferred form, a standard compatibility test can be carried out by the computer program utilizing the logic shown in Figure 4. Page 16, line 1, to page 17, line 19, describe other compatibility tests that can be conducted after the results of the cross match have been entered in the database.

Respectfully submitted,

By: John E. Reilly
Registration No. 18,476
Attorney for Applicants
1554 Emerson Street
Denver, Colorado 8018
Area Code 303 839-8700

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that the foregoing Amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, this 15th day of April, 2005.

Mary L. Robertson